

# Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies

Volume 6

Article 10

2019

## Exploring Relationship Description: A Report from the Describing Relationships Workshop, Simmons College, February 2018

Katherine M. Wisser

*School of Library and Information Science, Simmons University, [wisser@simmons.edu](mailto:wisser@simmons.edu)*

Hayley Mercer

*School of Library and Information Science, Simmons University, [hayley.mercer@simmons.edu](mailto:hayley.mercer@simmons.edu)*

Mitch Nakaue

*School of Library and Information Science, Simmons University, [nakaue@simmons.edu](mailto:nakaue@simmons.edu)*

Adrienne Pruitt

*Digital Collections and Archives, Tufts University, [Adrienne.Pruitt@tufts.edu](mailto:Adrienne.Pruitt@tufts.edu)*

Susan Pyzynski

*Houghton Library, Harvard University, [pyzynski@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:pyzynski@fas.harvard.edu)*

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas>

 Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Wisser, Katherine M.; Mercer, Hayley; Nakaue, Mitch; Pruitt, Adrienne; Pyzynski, Susan; and Sedgwick, Jessica M. (2019) "Exploring Relationship Description: A Report from the Describing Relationships Workshop, Simmons College, February 2018," *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies*: Vol. 6 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas/vol6/iss1/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies by an authorized editor of EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. For more information, please contact [elischolar@yale.edu](mailto:elischolar@yale.edu).

---

# Exploring Relationship Description: A Report from the Describing Relationships Workshop, Simmons College, February 2018

## **Authors**

Katherine M. Wisser, Hayley Mercer, Mitch Nakaue, Adrienne Pruitt, Susan Pyzynski, and Jessica M. Sedgwick

## “Describing Relationships Are the Future”: A Report from the Describing Relationships Workshop, Simmons College, February 2018

By Katherine M. Wisser, Adrienne Pruitt, Jessica Sedgwick, Susan Pyszynski, Hayley Mercer, and Mitch Nakaue

### Introduction

Archival description has undergone significant scrutiny in the last twenty years. With the onset of the World Wide Web and decreasing barriers to technological participation, the descriptive output of archivists is more likely than ever to be exposed to wide disclosure. These changes have run parallel with the development of standards both for the content and the delivery of description. Technological innovations have also brought new aspects of description into the spotlight.

The emergence of relationships as a central descriptive focus presents several problems for descriptive activities. While archivists have consistently included relationship information as a component of contextual and content description, they have not been called on to formalize that description in the way allowed for by recently developed structure standards. Hence, the identification of relationships results from informal narrative contexts, the choice of which is wholly dependent on the proper identification by the archivists and the determination that that relationship will assist in the construction of an appropriate context for understanding the records within a collection. With standards such as Encoded Archival Context-Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF), which allows for the establishment of a direct connection between two entities (<cpfRelation>) and content guidelines such as the International Standard for Archival Authority Records-Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (ISAAR[CPF]), which provides direction for the description of related entities in rule 5.3, relationship description is emerging as the next descriptive “wave.” Despite the fact that the description of relationships has been identified as significant, ISAAR(CPF) provides minimal guidance for the kinds of information that accompany the description of a relationship (i.e., type, description, and dates).<sup>1</sup> ISAAR(CPF) does little more than that and leaves a great number of questions surrounding an activity that archivists have been doing for a long time. Suddenly, describing relationships feels very new.

The Social Networks and Archival Context program (SNAC)<sup>2</sup> has placed relationship description at the forefront of twenty-first century description discussions. As SNAC engages more institutions and encourages more manual generation of entity description, including the intentional identification and description of relationships between entities, archivists are confronting a number of questions. Which relationships should be included? What should be said about those relationships? What is the relationship between the description of an entity and the description of the materials that are the primary charge of archivists? How do we handle difficult relationships? And finally, just how complex is the description of relationships? With the

---

<sup>1</sup> International Council on Archives, *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families*, 2nd ed. (Paris: International Council on Archives, 2004), 24–26, [https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS\\_Guidelines\\_ISAAR\\_Second-edition\\_EN.pdf](https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS_Guidelines_ISAAR_Second-edition_EN.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Social Networks and Archival Context, accessed September 7, 2018, <http://snaccooperative.org/static/about/about.html>.

emergence of linked data protocols and their integration into technology infrastructures used by more and more repositories, archivists are seeking answers to these and other similar questions.

To address the questions surfaced by recent innovations, four archivists in the Greater Boston area settled on a traditional strategy: a day-long workshop engaging local archivists in a series of large and small group discussions. The aim of the workshop was twofold: to revisit and reevaluate a traditional strategy for resolving these types of problems and to address the questions that relationship description has instigated. This paper provides a summary of what was learned on both fronts.

### **The Event**

In addition to the topic of the workshop itself, the conveners were interested in the effectiveness of a small, local, face-to-face meeting in exposing the diversity of problems and in achieving some kind of consensus that could be reported to the larger community. The conveners also believed that it could potentially serve as a model for similar events in other areas in order to allow a multitude of voices to address the problem and intentionally planned the execution and assessment of the event accordingly.

The primary goal of the event was to bring together a group of archivists to talk about describing relationships: why it is important to describe relationships, what is challenging about it, and how archivists can do it well. In the planning process, the conveners were very intentional about how the event was organized to ensure that they were creating an engaging and fruitful experience. First, this event would be a “workshop” in the truest sense of the word. Rather than participants showing up to learn something from presenters, which is how the term workshop is often used in the profession, this event was intended to support a day dedicated to working through the issues collectively and to gathering insights and ideas from the group as a whole. This strategy came from the fact that the conveners themselves had more questions than answers. Second, it was decided that this discussion should take place in person, rather than in a virtual environment. Understanding that these issues are complex and difficult to wrestle with, it was felt that an in-person discussion would be the most effective way to get started.

Group size was one of the first considerations. Group size can impact active and thoughtful conversation, so the target size was twenty to twenty-five participants (not including the conveners and student assistants). Along with group size, the conveners wanted to include those individuals who would be invested in and engaged with the topic. For these reasons, targeted invitations were sent mostly to local archivists representing a wide range of institutional settings including academic archives, historical societies, government archives, church archives, and corporate archives, as well as to archival educators and others. There were thirty-three invitations sent, twenty-seven accepted, and twenty-five guests ultimately attended the workshop. Simmons College library science students were invited to participate as well. The students helped with logistics for the day, took notes, and participated in small group discussions. The four conveners and six student volunteers also formed part of the participant pool, leading to a total number of thirty-five participants. Because this event was designed to pilot the model as well as start the conversation, important factors such as diversity considerations were not specifically addressed but would need to be part of any future event planning.

Funding for the event was awarded from the Emily Hollowell Research Fund at the School of Library and Information Science at Simmons College, which supported catering and parking for participants. The event was held at Simmons College in February 2018.

To ensure all participants arrived at the workshop with at least some common expectations and a shared framework for discussion, pre-readings were identified<sup>3</sup> and participants were asked to complete a brief survey (see the appendix). The survey was structured to identify how participants thought about and approached relationships in archival description before the experience of the workshop. To achieve this, questions focused on current descriptive practices, identification of relationship significance in four categories (familial, work, social, and controversial), and components of relationships that should be included in description, such as dates, types, places, events, and so on. The results of the pre-workshop survey were compiled and distributed in the participant packet for the day. Additionally, participants were asked to provide an example of a relationship they have encountered in the context of their archival collections in order to create a sample set of relationships that could be used during the workshop. These were also compiled and distributed in the participant packet.

The workshop day began with some presentations to orient the group to some of the challenges and opportunities surrounding the description of relationships and to highlight current efforts. Kathy Wisser presented on a few research initiatives that looked at relationships in existing archival description, relationship vocabularies, and the Small World project. Jerry Simmons presented a basic introduction to the SNAC cooperative, including a walk around the interface.<sup>4</sup> Susan Pyzynski presented on the Connecting the Dots collaboration created by the Houghton Library at Harvard University and the Beinecke Library at Yale University, including the creation of a relationship vocabulary in the second phase of the project. Betts Coup presented on two EAC-CPF implementations: one for the Desegregation Project at Northeastern University, and a general template she developed for the Center for the History of Medicine at Harvard Medical School's Countway Library.

Following the presentations, Adrienne Pruitt and Jessica Sedgwick led the group through a discussion, including time for questions and answers resulting from the morning's presentations. They led an exercise that asked participants to think back to the example relationship they had provided in the pre-workshop survey in order to tease out different aspects of the relationship and interrogate what they would or would not include in its archival description. Following that, participants discussed what factors went into that assessment.

---

<sup>3</sup> Suggested pre-readings included the following from the *Journal of Archival Organization* 12, nos. 1–2 (2015): Anila Angjeli and Katherine M. Wisser, "Identity Matters: Describing and Interconnecting with EAC-CPF," 1–3; Daniel V. Pitti, Rachael Hu, Ray Larson, Brian Tingle, and Adrian Turner, "Social Networks and Archival Context: From Project to Cooperative Archival Program," 77–97; Ellen Doon, Susan Pyzynski, Michael Rush, and Melanie Wisner, "Tracing Johnson's Circle: Practical Experiments with EAC-CPF," 51–61, and Ricardo Eito-Brun, "A Metadata Infrastructure for a Repository of Civil Engineering Records: EAC-CPF as a Cornerstone for Content Publishing," 62–76. The other article recommended was Kara Long, Santi Thompson, Sarah Potvin, and Monica Rivero, "The 'Wicked Problem' of Neutral Description: Toward a Documentation Approach to Metadata Standards," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (2017): 107–28.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that Jerry was unable to attend in person but was able to give his own presentation via web conferencing software. He attended most of the day's events in that manner.

In the afternoon session, participants were randomly assigned to small groups. Each group was tasked with discussing a particular topic related to relationship description. The topics of those break out groups included:

1. The directionality of relationships: bidirectional versus unidirectional
2. The temporal nature of relationships
3. Negative and sensitive relationships
4. Boundaries of description and describing relationships
5. The viewpoint of the content describer
6. Multiple relationships between two entities

At the end of the day, the small groups reported on their ideas about the breakout group topics, and Susan Pyzynski led a large group discussion to sum up the day and talk about next steps.

Summative evaluations from participants indicated that the day as a whole was successful. Over 80 percent of the participants found each segment of the day useful or very useful. The morning presentations were considered important “esp. for those of us who have not been a part of the SNAC project and other earlier projects.” Others noted that even more introductory material would have helped to better articulate the need and set the stage for what was being discussed during the day. One participant did note, though: “I’ve read various articles about EAC-CPF, and have found them a little bit vague. I really appreciated the opportunity to hear the presentations in person and to be able to ask clarifying questions. Really helpful.” This comment reaffirmed the conveners’ interest in the face-to-face local model. Sometimes it is useful to get in a room and talk about things, despite the perception that that value is outweighed by the need to do everything virtually and in as broadly participatory a manner as possible. Other comments in the evaluations noted the cross-institutional representation and the possibility for most participants to engage in small and large group discussions. This translated not only to the availability of participation but also the willingness of participants to engage. One participant noted: “I liked how almost everyone participated and seemed really engaged with the questions.”

The small group breakout sessions garnered the most feedback, both on the topic and on the format. While the assessments were still rated as useful or very useful by 83 percent of the survey respondents, the comments were more mixed in their responses. Many of the constructive comments centered on the amount of time allotted for these group breakout sessions, including “could have been shorter” and “way too long!” Some suggested retaining the time allotted but providing more topics to discuss. One participant noted that their assigned question did not provide enough for them to consider so they discussed the other questions as well. If understood as a suggestion, it may have been more fruitful for each group to consider each of the six questions leading to a compilation of the six perspectives for each question.

The length of the day itself was also a target of criticism. This was revealed when survey respondents addressed the final group discussion. While respondents seemed to find it useful, they were also tired by the time the group reached that portion of the day. This could be attributed to the misappropriation of time between the small group and large group discussion periods. Despite these critiques, the participants felt like this was an important part of the day, particularly after the readouts from the small group discussions. One participant noted: “I think

maybe energy was waning at this point in the afternoon, but there were still a lot of good points made. Susan did a good job of steering the conversation back on track when tangents appeared.” Another participant suggested working over the lunch break in order to get to this point in the content earlier in the afternoon.

When asked about major takeaways from the events, participant responses were varied. Many regarded being kept up to date, raising awareness of the latest trends, and being a part of larger discussions as very important. Others responded that their repository needed to get more involved in initiatives like SNAC, but that that would require the allocation of time and resources.

Finally, participants were asked if they would attend similar events if offered. Responses were very positive, with one participant noting: “We have a very limited professional development funding at my repository, and so the opportunity to do something like this locally was fantastic.” Some constructive comments about the logistics of the day can help inform any future efforts. Comments on communication and accessibility to the pre-readings were noted, but in particular, better preparation for participants was a significant suggestion: “Having a bit more of an idea of what was expected of me as an attendee/participant would have been helpful.” Ultimately, the survey reinforced the conveners’ perception that the model established was a fruitful way to wrestle with complex issues such as describing relationships, because as one participant noted, “describing relationships are the future.”

## Themes

Overall, the most important outcome from the workshop was the expressed desire for guidance on the description of relationships. A universal standard across repositories for describing relationships would be difficult, but guidelines on what archivists should consider when crafting policies on the subject could be helpful. Guidelines would allow for variation among repositories while maintaining a sense of standardization. In general, these guidelines should include factors such as feasibility or necessity and the consideration of any special needs or topical focuses of a repository. Existing archival description guidelines established by repositories can also serve as useful direction in creating relationship description guidelines. It was generally agreed that that guidance would best be placed in the form of best practice guidelines that could be subject to the institution’s own interpretation. These guidelines would provide some help with the following themes that emerged from the breakout and large group discussions:

### *Complexity and granularity*

The most prevalent theme that emerged from the small breakout groups was the complexity of relationships and the necessary levels of granularity that need to go into the description of those relationships. Different groups grappled with those issues in different ways and the compilation of their ideas forms an excellent baseline for considering these issues.

One group believed that the nature of the entities involved in the relationship was an important facet of the problem. Considering the temporal perspective of relationships illustrates the significance of the entity type. Relationships between individual people tend to evolve over time, making it difficult to establish a definitive date when a relationship begins. For example, people start as acquaintances; personal relationships can grow into friendships or devolve into

antagonisms. Personal relationships are also driven by cultural distinctions that are defined at a group level, such as tribes with social conventions that reinforce traditions. In contrast, relationships between corporate bodies and persons or other corporate bodies tend to be more formal and their temporal nature is easier to track.

The formality or informality of relationships was a facet that emerged. However, it was determined that while there are strictly formal and strictly informal relationships, more often than not there is a mix of formal and informal relationships, particularly between people. For example, the relationship between Virginia Woolf and Vita Sackville-West was very multifaceted; one of the participants used terms to describe this relationship that included friends, lovers, muse, and publisher. The last relationship type could be understood as a formal relationship, while the former relationship types are necessarily informal. This example demonstrates the phenomenon of multiple relationships between two entities.

Formal relationships in corporate bodies can also demonstrate complexity. In another example provided, the network of relationships of the Boston legislative system illustrates the management of hierarchy but also temporal factors. In the nineteenth century, Boston had a bicameral legislative system, referred to as the City Council. The mayor headed the Board of Aldermen, one of the bodies in that bicameral system. In the twentieth century Boston switched to a unicameral system. The City Council became a single legislative body, the mayor became an executive office entirely separate from the City Council, and so on. The relationships between the office of the mayor and the legislative bodies is important to understand the records regarding the governing of Boston over time.

Finally, there are relationships that are challenging to handle. Adversarial relationships may be less well documented in materials, but they also exist. In one collection of faculty papers, a list titled “my enemies” was found. The list included the names of many of this faculty member’s immediate colleagues, several of whom were in fact also donors of personal papers to the repository, just to further complicate things. One problem with this example is that there is no way to know if there is reciprocity in this adversarial relationship; would the folks on that list *also* consider the original faculty member to be an “enemy”?

These three examples illustrate the dimensions of complexity that archivists encounter in describing relationships. The dimensions uncovered in the examples demonstrate that relationships are not trite or conventional but require careful and deliberate consideration.

### *Language*

Issues around language were prevalent throughout the small and large group discussions. There were two main concerns around language: general terminology considerations and sensitivity with the choice of words and the reliance on controlled vocabularies. Archivists are increasingly questioning the terminology used in description and the way that terminology conveys characteristics of the individuals being represented. Rinn’s examination of language in relation to the description of disabilities in the P. T. Barnum Digital Collection is an excellent illustration of the theoretical currents being considered by archivists. She questions the contrast between the contemporary understanding of “performers with disabilities and unusual bodies” and the language used to describe them. As she notes, “There is no avoiding the fact that these were



people whose very bodies defined them as performers and were the primary factor in their rise to fame. Their legacy is tangled up in the complicated space of what defined entertainment in the past and what comprises identity in the present, and as a result creates significant challenges in making this material accessible to the public in a manner that is respectful and conscious of these nuances.”<sup>5</sup> Sensitivity to language usage requires archivists to be culturally aware and cognizant of power dynamics. This needs to be coupled with a transparency about inferences and guesses in description.

Associated with the sensitivities of language usage was the importance of controlled vocabulary usage. In Wisser’s presentation, she noted that existing terminology for identifying relationship types is broad. Pyzynski’s discussion of the interstitial stage of the “Connecting the Dots” Johnson-Boswell project revealed the creation of a controlled vocabulary (MOB ID) that reflected the boundaries of the project.<sup>6</sup> It was confirmed that domain-specific language should be leveraged whenever possible in the typology of relationships, and that a single controlled vocabulary for relationship description would be generic at best.

### *Transparency*

Another theme that provided some space for consensus was the increasing recognition of the importance of documenting the source of information on relationships. This call for transparency extends beyond just citations to sources but also to the determination processes archivists undergo to characterize relationships. It was concluded that this kind of documentation is necessary for reliable and trusted description. This includes notions of warrant and citations and the role of formal evidence of relationships in the records. More nuanced relationships include those that are not documented within the records, those relationships that are suggested and based on inference. One potential issue that illustrates the necessity of clear documentation is those relationships that are documented in multiple sources with conflicting information. Projects such as the SNAC have begun to recognize and facilitate this type of documentation. SNAC uses an assertion identification as part of its input protocols for data.

### *Boundaries*

The issue of boundaries was important to the discussions. As with other innovations in description, participants called for a reexamination of the role of the archivist vis-à-vis the role of the researcher. Part of this is the weight placed on determining which relationships (and which aspects of relationships) are worth describing. Participants recognized that description is iterative and can be updated and augmented as new information, evidence, or resources become available. But that does not help in determining whether or not the archivist should be engaging in the interpretive work that may be involved in description. Does the relationship need to be documented in the collection that an archivist holds in order to legitimately describe it? Or should the description of relationships be considered external to the descriptive work that archivists do for their collections?

---

<sup>5</sup> Meghan Rinn, “Nineteenth-Century Depictions of Disabilities and Modern Metadata: A Consideration of Material in the P. T. Barnum Digital Collection,” *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* 5, no. 1 (2018), <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas/vol5/iss1/1>.

<sup>6</sup> “Connecting the Dots: Manner of Belonging; Interstitial Description of Dr. Johnson’s Circle,” Harvard Wiki, accessed September 7, 2018, <https://wiki.harvard.edu/confluence/display/connectingdots/Relationships+and+vocabulary>.

### *The nature of “truth”*

The historical record is already an incomplete and skewed representation of “what really happened.” Archival description is an even more narrow representation of reality. Acknowledging that all description is influenced by personal and institutional biases is an important aspect of twenty-first-century perspectives on archival descriptive work. In that context, relationships are inherently complicated and ever-changing, and what the relationship looks like from the outside could be very different from how the actual people in the relationship might view it. Archivists need to acknowledge and be open about their role and its limits in content description. Archivists bring both their own personal viewpoints and the viewpoints of their institution to their work, and this will influence their description. The collections an institution holds provide a frame of reference for the description created about a person, and that will often only be a partial view of the person. This limitation can be reconciled through efforts at transparency and citations discussed above.

### *Tools and technology*

Tools and technology are often believed to drive all practice. They served to shape the conversation in the discussions, including such topics as linked data, the ability to suppress or embargo description or portions of description, or the ability to encode levels of certainty. Tools and technology also afforded a space for creativity. For instance, in one small group, the participants mused over the potential to encode the positive/negative axis of a relationship or its relative strength over time. Systems could leverage that information to create visualizations such as: “Relationship strength currently at 10 percent” along a temporal scale.

Resources always end up being a point of discussion as people consider how to make it all happen. It was unclear whether or not the description of relationships would require an additional influx of resources or resources could be reallocated from other efforts. The cost-benefit analysis, however, needs to take place and projects such as SNAC are helping to make the argument for the expenditure of resources to increase access to archival materials.

### **Results from the Workshop: Summary of Initial Recommendations**

- Citations should be required for all assertions about a relationship.
- Archivists should create and follow local policies for specifying the nature of relationships.
- Use domain-specific categories (allow experts to define language)—include definitions and point to the controlled vocabulary or source of the language used in description.
- When in doubt, describe the relationship using the most neutral/general term, and have policies defining basic/optimal levels of description.
- Recognize that description is iterative and may change as new evidence comes to light.
- As the nature of relationships often changes over time, encoding of relationships should be time-delimited when possible.
- Understand that this work may be more challenging for living donors/entities and contemporary collections.

### **Future Steps**

Based on the conversations begun at the workshop, there is still much that needs to be explored around the description of relationships. There are different strategies for how to go about this

further work, but it is clear that this workshop was only a nascent step in the process. Perspectives on the best practice for the description of relationships will develop over time, but the more that archivists actively engage with the problems the stronger those practices will become.

One strategy that can contribute to these developments and not require the kind of infrastructure a planned workshop entails would be to focus on the creation of a compendium of example relationships that will surface the issues to be addressed in best practices. Two examples submitted by participants prior to the workshop illustrate this strategy:

Amos Lawrence Avery and his brother William H. Avery founded W. H. & A. L. Avery, a general store in Charlemont, Massachusetts, in 1861. Amos purchased control of the store from his brother in 1867, becoming the sole proprietor, and renamed the store A. L. Avery. He ran the business by himself until 1890, when he formed a partnership with his son Oscar and renamed the store A. L. Avery & Son. As of 2013, the store continues to be operated by the Avery family, making it one of the oldest family-run businesses in the United States.

### *Example 1*

In the Avery example (example 1), what appears to be simple on the surface reveals complexities, and there are decisions to be made. For instance, Amos and William were brothers and they were business partners. They were brothers for their entire life, but the business partnership was for a limited time. The same layer of complexity exists between Amos and Oscar, father and son throughout, but the business partnership started in 1890. It is not clear whether or not there were other sons that were not a part of the business, but if that was the case, the familial relationships could be considered even more separate than the business one. It is assumed that at some point the father-son partnership changed, either through dissolution or death. In describing the relationship between Amos and William, do we preference the familial relationship ahead of the business relationship? It may be that something significant happened in 1867 between the two brothers that led to the dissolution of the partnership. How do we handle not only potential negative relationships but also changes in relationships over time?

Percival C. Norris (1880–1938)—age 58 years, teacher at private high school Richard Le Baron Bowen Jr (1919–?)—age 19 years, student of Norris at that school. Correspondence between Percival Chandler Norris and Richard Le Baron Bowen Jr. from 1937 September 23 until 1938 January 31. The collection includes the typed carbon copies of the letters Norris wrote to Bowen and Bowen's responses. Norris wrote 131 pages as numbered by Norris. He sent multiple letters each week to Bowen. Bowen sent a total of 8 handwritten letters and 3 handwritten notes. Norris was a teacher at the Providence Country Day School where Bowen was a student. Norris was clearly "infatuated with" Bowen. Do we out someone as gay who did not out themselves? It is unclear whether or not Bowen was also gay. We purchased this correspondence from a dealer.

### *Example 2*

The Norris example (example 2) provides a different set of problems. Based on the way that this relationship is interpreted in the description, there was a relationship between Norris and Bowen and that relationship has some ambiguity in it. For example, the description indicates Norris writing over one hundred pages and Bowen writing significantly fewer. The conclusion drawn is that Norris had unrequited affections for Bowen. The collection itself does not provide definitive evidence that Bowen did not write any more letters or notes to Norris, so it is not clear what the true dimensions of the relationship were, its strength or reciprocity. Additionally, sexual persuasion is questioned as well here. Is it appropriate to infer sexual orientation? Romantic or affectionate relationships do not always include a sexual component.

Compiling examples reveals description choices that are made and provides a data set that can inform the development of best practices. Without broad exposure to the decisions and interpretations that are already underway, it would be difficult to account for all the factors that need to be considered. A example compilation would also provide material to inform further discussion in the description of relationships problem space. Archivists have long been describing relationships in the narrative contextual passages of their collection descriptions, so it would be useful to leverage that existing information to inform the process of establishing best practices.

In the end, the workshop raised significant questions, not only about the description of relationships, but about descriptive work in general.

## References

- Angeli, Anila, and Katherine M. Wisser. "Identity Matters: Describing and Interconnecting with EAC-CPF." *Journal of Archival Organization* 12, nos. 1–2 (2015): 1–3.
- "Connecting the Dots: Manner of Belonging; Interstitial Description of Dr. Johnson's Circle." Harvard Wiki. Accessed on September 7, 2018.  
<https://wiki.harvard.edu/confluence/display/connectingdots/Relationships+and+vocabulary>.
- Doon, Ellen, Susan Pyzynski, Michael Rush, and Melanie Wisner. "Tracing Johnson's Circle: Practical Experiments with EAC-CPF." *Journal of Archival Organization* 12, nos. 1–2 (2015): 51–61.
- Eito-Brun, Ricardo. "A Metadata Infrastructure for a Repository of Civil Engineering Records: EAC-CPF as a Cornerstone for Content Publishing." *Journal of Archival Organization* 12, nos. 1–2 (2015): 62–76.
- International Council on Archives. *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families*. 2nd ed. (2004).  
[https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS\\_Guidelines\\_ISAAR\\_Second-edition\\_EN.pdf](https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/CBPS_Guidelines_ISAAR_Second-edition_EN.pdf).
- Long, Kara, Santi Thompson, Sarah Potvin, and Monica Rivero. "The 'Wicked Problem' of Neutral Description: Toward a Documentation Approach to Metadata Standards." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (2017): 107–28.
- Pitti, Daniel V., Rachael Hu, Ray Larson, Brian Tingle, and Adrian Turner. "Social Networks and Archival Context: From Project to Cooperative Archival Program." *Journal of Archival Organization* 12, nos. 1–2 (2015): 77–97.

Rinn, Meghan. "Nineteenth-Century Depictions of Disabilities and Modern Metadata: A Consideration of Material in the P. T. Barnum Digital Collection." *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* 5, no. 1 (2018): <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas/vol5/iss1/1>.  
Social Networks and Archival Context. Accessed on September 7, 2018. <http://snaccooperative.org/static/about/about.html>.

Appendix:

Pre-Workshop Survey

This survey is intended to give us a starting point for discussion in our day-long workshop. It should take about 10–15 minutes to complete.

1. How do relationships between entities (corporate bodies/persons/families) figure into your current descriptive practices?
2. For the next four questions, please select all relationships you think are significant (by significant we mean that you would indicate the relationship and describe it as part of the description of an entity)

*Familial Relationships*

Estranged husband

Great aunt

Niece

Step daughter

Common-law wife

*Work Relationships*

Taught at

Handled publishing affairs

Contracted with

Handyman for New Hampshire farm

Served on the board of directors for

*Social Relationships*

Dated

Had a fistfight with

High school running buddy

Jealous of

Infatuated with

*Controversial Relationships*

Saved (converted)

Stole bread from

Enslaved by (owned by)

Imprisoned at

Threatened to sue

6. Please identify components of relationships that need to be included in relationship categories (select all that apply)

Date information (start/stop of relationship)

Type of relationship

Events significant to the relationship

Geographic places associated with the relationship

Strength of relationship (e.g., acquaintance vs. friend vs. close friend)

Changes in relationship over time

Other (please specify)

7. Please supply a relationship from your own collections/repository. These relationships will be compiled into a sample set to work with during the workshop.
8. Respondent name (all results will be aggregated and anonymized)

### Post-Workshop Survey

We were so glad people were able to attend the Developing Best Practices for Describing Relationships workshop on February 13th. We feel like the day was a productive one, but would like to get feedback on the structure and execution of the day so that going forward we can make these kinds of events even more meaningful and productive! This evaluation is very short and should take no more than 5 minutes to complete. No identifying information will be collected.

Please rate the value of the various sections of the day

Event	1: Very useful	2: Useful	3: Neither useful or not useful	4: Not useful	5: Very not useful
Morning presentations					
Comment:					
Morning group discussion					
Comment:					
Small group breakouts					
Comment:					
Afternoon group discussion					
Comment:					

If your boss asks you what the major takeaway from the day was, what is your answer?

If additional events such as this are planned, would you like to participate?

Please provide any feedback on the logistics of the day (event communication, facility, catering, packet, etc.).